

REMARKS

The Applicants thank Examiners Muktesh Gupta and Yemane Meslin very much for the courtesy extended in the interview held by telephone on 18 February 2010.

Claims 1 to 20 are pending. The Office Action rejected independent claims 1 and 11 as being anticipated by Matters et al. (US 2003/0208531).

In the interview, the Applicants' agent, Gavin Manning, pointed out that Matters et al., as understood, does not disclose a full-duplex packetized interconnect directly connecting a CPU and a network interface in a compute node. The Applicants understand that the Examiners agree that this is the case and that the Examiners agree that Matters et al. does not anticipate either of independent claims 1 and 11.

As discussed, claim 1 recites a method comprising "placing the data on a full-duplex packetized interconnect directly connecting a CPU of the first compute node to a first network interface of the first compute node ...".

Claim 11 recites "a dedicated full-duplex packetized interconnect directly coupling the CPU to the first network interface ...".

The Applicants note that Franke (US 6542513), as understood, which is cited in relation to dependent claims 6-7 and 13-14, does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Matters et al.

As the Office Action raises no other issues with claims 1 and 11, claims 1 and 11 and their dependent claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 to 20 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /GavinNManning/
Gavin N. Manning
Registration No. 36,412
tel: 604.669.3432 ext. 9043
fax: 604.681.4081
e-mail: GNMDocket@patentable.com